



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/325,508	06/03/1999	MICHAEL A. CHACK	P0056	2904

7590

01/22/2003

ANDRE L. MARAIS
BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP
12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD, 17TH FL
LOS ANGELES, CA 90025

EXAMINER

THOMPSON, MARC D

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2142

DATE MAILED: 01/22/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Interview Summary

Application No.

09/325,508

Applicant(s)

CHACK

Examiner

Marc Thompson

Art Unit

2142



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Marc Thompson

(3) _____

(2) Adam Furst (Reg. #51,710)

(4) _____

Date of Interview Jan 21, 2003Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conferencec) ☐ Personal [copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No. If yes, brief description:Claim(s) discussed: 1, generally

Identification of prior art discussed:

Madduri, Foladare, both of recordAgreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Applicant was advised that Examiner remained firm with the position set forth in final Office action. Further amendment of the claims by Applicant is required (upon RCE or comparable filing) to overcome the applied prior art, specifically Foladare. Applicant suggested limiting protocol stack(s) and/or specific server applications used for connectivity and definition of "availability determinations" in network servers to further limit subject matter. Examiner warned Applicant to avoid situations involving new matter, and reported that narrowing of the claim language would necessitate further search in order to determine whether a rejection was proper at that time. Applicant and Examiner agreed that specific applications (e.g., e-mail, FTP, HTTP) introduce specific aspects of the invention not previously claimed.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

MARC THOMPSON 2142

Examiner's signature, if required